R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 591 VT 001 556

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, REVIEW OF ABSENCES OF TRAINEES ENROLLED IN INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED BY THE MANPOWER DEVEOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL (GAO), WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE APR 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.12 26P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *ATTENDANCE, *EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, *MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT,

FROM THE INCEPTION OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM IN MARCH 1962 UNTIL SEPTEMBER 1964, THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE ISSUED VIRTUALLY NO GUIDELINES TO STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS REGARDING TRAINEE ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS. THE ATTENDANCE RECORDS OF 2,902 TRAINEES PREPARED BY TRAINING ORGANIZATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA WERE REVIEWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE. ON THE AVERAGE, THE TRAINEES WERE ABSENT FROM CLASS 8.5 PERCENT OF THE TIME, AND ABSENTEEISM WAS IN EXCESS OF 25 PERCENT IN MANY INSTANCES. HOWEVER, THE TRAINEES HAD RECEIVED FULL TRAINING ALLOWANCES. ATTENDANCE REPORTS COVERING 7,900 TRAINEES IN CALIFORNIA, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, AND NEW JERSEY SHOWED SIMILAR HIGH ABSENTEE RATES. CONSEQUENTLY, THE MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ISSUED AN ORDER ON SEPTEMBER 2, 1964, DEFINING EXCUSED ABSENCES AND PROVIDING FOR REDUCTION OF TRAINING ALLOWANCES TO ELIMINATE PAYMENTS FOR UNEXCUSED ABSENCES. ON THE BASIS OF THIS STUDY, IT WAS RECOMMENDED (1) THAT THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE MAKE PERIODIC REVIEWS AND ANALYSES OF ATTENDANCE AND, IN THE EVENT OF CONTINUED ABSENCES AS NOTED IN PENNSYLVANIA, HE PROVIDE, WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF STATE AGENCIES IN DETERMINING THE NUMBER OF ABSENCES, EXCUSED AND UNEXCUSED, PERMISSIBLE FOR SATISFACTORY ATTENDANCE, AND (2) THAT THE SECRETARY OF LABOR ESTABLISH GUIDELINE CRITERIA AS TO THE NUMBER OF EXCUSED ABSENCES FOR WHICH TRAINING ALLOWANCES MAY BE PAID. A LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS HAVING RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTERING THE TRAINING PROGRAMS IS INCLUDED. (PS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED018591

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

REVIEW OF ABSENCES OF TRAINEES ENROLLED IN INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED BY THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

AND

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

BY

THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 1966

VT 004 184

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-146879 April 29, 1966

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives

The General Accounting Office has made a review of the procedures and practices of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare applicable to payments of training allowances to individuals enrolled in institutional training programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This report presents our findings, conclusion, and recommendations based on this review.

From the inception of the manpower development and training program in March 1962 until September 1964, the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare issued virtually no guidelines to State and local officials regarding trainee attendance requirements. In accordance with the intent of the Congress, the training agencies had the responsibility of determining whether those trainees whose attendance was unsatisfactory had good cause for their absenteeism, a determination without which the Department of Labor could not permit continued payment of training allowances.

In our review of selected training programs in the State of Pennsylvania, we found that, in the absence of departmental criteria as to trainee attendance requirements or of any definition of "satisfactory attendance," local training organizations reported attendance as satisfactory and trainees received full weekly training allowances even though they had records of extensive absenteeism. In many instances, absenteeism was in excess of 25 percent of the total course time. We estimated that, from program inception through fiscal year 1964, the Department of Labor paid, nationwide, about $3.1 million of a total of $36.9 million as training allowances for days on which the trainees were absent from classes.

In June 1964 we proposed to the Department of Labor that training allowances be paid only for days in attendance unless absences are specifically excused for reasons stated in guidelines which would be issued by the Department. In September 1964 the Department of Labor

issued instructions providing for reduction of training allowances to eliminate payments for unexcused absences.

The Department of Labor advised us that the instructions had been designed to deal with payments of training allowances for periods of absence and that it believed that the instructions would correct many cases of poor judgment such as occurred in the past but, to the extent they did not, the Department would be glad to reexamine the criteria with a view toward obtaining greater precision, achieving more uniformity, and minimizing excessive excuse of absences. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that the absenteeism was not excessive and that it believed that the establishment of overall attendance criteria was not feasible or practicable.

The instructions issued by the Department of Labor should help to reduce absenteeism, but whether they will adequately control absences, both excused and unexcused, and thus achieve a record of satisfactory attendance for continued enrollment and training can be determined only by considering future results.

On the basis of our review, we are recommending that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare make periodic reviews and analyses of attendance and that, in the event of continuation of absences such as we noted in Pennsylvania, he provide, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, guidelines for the use of State agencies in determining the number of absences, excused and unexcused, permissible for satisfactory attendance.

We are recommending also that the Secretary of Labor, in the interests of orderly and uniform administration of the payment of training allowances, establish guideline criteria as to the number of excused absences for which training allowances may be paid.

This report is being issued to inform the Congress of the high rate of absenteeism found in the manpower training program, the corrective action taken by the agencies, and our recommendations on this matter.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States; the Secretary of Labor; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Elmer B. Staats

Comptroller General
of the United States

Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
Training allowances paid for absences from training classes	4
Attendance in training classes not required as a basis for receiving training allowances	4
Attendance standards for termination purposes	8
Agencies' comments	12
Conclusion	15
Recommendations	16
SCOPE OF REVIEW	17
APPENDIX	
Principal officials of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare having responsibility for the administration of the training programs	21

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ABSENCES OF TRAINEES ENROLLED IN INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED BY THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office has made a review of the procedures and practices of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare applicable to payments of training allowances to individuals enrolled in institutional training programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2571).

Our review was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67). This review was directed primarily toward an examination of the controls exercised over attendance by trainees and the consideration given to attendance in determining allowances payable to trainees--two aspects of the training programs which appeared to warrant attention. In view of the restricted scope of our review, which was limited primarily to selected projects within the State of Pennsylvania, the matters disclosed herein should not be considered indicative of the overall administration of the training programs. The scope of our review is described on page 17.

BACKGROUND

The objectives of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) are to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, reduce the costs of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and increase the Nation's productivity and its capacity to meet the requirements of the space age. The act authorized the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to institute training programs for unemployed and underemployed individuals in order to carry out these objectives.

Training costs are financed by the Federal Government through appropriations to the Department of Labor. Under the act, as amended, appropriations totaling $966 million were authorized for fiscal years 1962 through 1966. For fiscal years 1964 and 1965, the Congress appropriated $130 million and $397 million, respectively, for this program.

The Secretary of Labor is responsible for determining the occupations for which skilled individuals are needed and for the testing, counseling, and referring of persons for training. The Secretary enters into agreements with the States to enable them to obtain training funds and to make payments of weekly training allowances to the selected unemployed persons during training. The act provides that training allowances not be paid to any person for any week for which he has received or is seeking unemployment compensation.

Originally, the training allowances were not to exceed the average amounts paid weekly by the individual States as unemployment compensation. An amendment to the act in December 1963 increased the authorized maximum weekly allowances to $10 more than the average State unemployment compensation payments. Another

amendment dated April 26, 1965, provided that the allowances may be increased by $5 a week for each dependent in excess of two, up to a maximum of four additional dependents. In November 1965, the average nationwide payment for unemployment compensation was $38.08 a week. The average payment in the State of Pennsylvania for comparable unemployment compensation was $34.97.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is responsible for providing training programs, including curriculums, instructors, and facilities, for the occupations determined and trainees selected by the Secretary of Labor. These functions are being administered by the Office of Education through agreements with State vocational education agencies.

More than 7,600 institutional training projects were approved from the inception of the program in March 1962 through December 31, 1965. Classroom-type instruction in public and private vocational school facilities is used for these projects. Training projects are initiated by local agencies, usually to meet local needs for trained workers on the part of employers and for improved skills on the part of unemployed workers. Training has been approved for some 500 occupations. The most popular institutional training courses are for stenographers, general machine operators, automobile mechanics, nurse's aides, clerk-typists, welders, and licensed practical nurses.

The principal officials of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare having responsibility for the administration of the training programs are listed in the appendix.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

TRAINING ALLOWANCES PAID FOR ABSENCES FROM TRAINING CLASSES

From the inception of the manpower development and training program in March 1962 until September 1964, the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) issued virtually no guidelines to State and local officials regarding trainee attendance requirements. In accordance with the intent of the Congress, the training agencies had the responsibility of determining whether those trainees whose attendance was unsatisfactory had good cause for their absenteeism, a determination without which the Department of Labor could not permit continued payment of training allowances.

In the absence of departmental criteria as to trainee attendance requirements or of any definition of "satisfactory attendance," local training organizations reported attendance as satisfactory and trainees received full weekly training allowances even though they had records of extensive absenteeism. In many instances, absenteeism was in excess of 25 percent of the total course time.

Our review disclosed that, on the average, the trainees were absent from class about 8.5 percent of the time. On the basis of this percentage of absence, we estimate that, from program inception through fiscal year 1964, the Department of Labor paid about $3.1 million of a total of $36.9 million as training allowances for days on which the trainees were absent from classes.

Attendance in training classes not required as a basis for receiving training allowances

We noted that training instructors certified some trainees as eligible for allowances for particular weeks even though their attendance was very poor. Neither Labor nor HEW had established

criteria pertaining to what constituted satisfactory attendance nor had they established any limitation on the number of absences that could be excused or the number of excused absences for which payment could be made.

During our review of attendance records of 2,902 trainees prepared by training organizations in the State of Pennsylvania, we noted many individual instances of poor attendance. For example, 172 trainees were reported absent from scheduled classes from 15 to 25 percent of the total number of days in their training courses and 165 trainees were reported absent at least 25 percent of the total days. In addition, we noted that one trainee who had been reported absent 65 of a possible 177 days was still enrolled in the course at the time of our review and had received full weekly training allowances for the entire period. Two other trainees who had been absent 41 and 49 of a possible 167 days were also paid for the entire period. One trainee was hospitalized for 5 consecutive weeks and received training allowances for all 5 weeks. In 64 instances, trainees absent from classes for an entire week were certified as eligible for payment by the training officials and, as a result, the trainees received full training allowances for these periods.

We note that, in other federally financed training programs, a limitation has been placed on the number of absences for which payment may be made. Regulations of the Veterans Administration governing payment of training allowances to veterans enrolled in institutional courses not leading to standard college degrees and to veterans enrolled in apprenticeship courses or other training on the job provide that allowances not be paid for any day of absence in excess of the rate of 30 days in a 12-month period, not counting

as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation.

The practice of paying trainees for periods of absence differs from the payment practices that trainees will likely encounter in training-related employment. Pennsylvania Employment Service officials informed us during our review that, in the type of employment usually obtained upon completion of training, MDTA trainees would not be entitled to receive wages for days away from work. They stated that attendance was a basic requirement for service and maintenance workers, as well as for workers in other occupations. For the most part, these State officials believed that MDTA trainees should not receive allowances for days of nonattendance, regardless of the reasons.

Opinions on trainees' attendance were also obtained from various local training organization officials in Pennsylvania. They emphasized that trainee attendance was a primary concern and expressed the opinion that better attendance would result if the trainees were paid only for days on which they attend classes. One training official, who supervised the training of a substantial number of MDTA trainees, said that paying allowances on an attendance basis would better prepare workers for employment because the individuals are generally trained for positions paying an hourly wage and, in such positions, are usually paid only for time worked.

Our review of the attendance reports for all trainees of completed projects in the State of Pennsylvania indicated that trainees' absences from scheduled classes averaged more than 10 of about 120 days, or 8.5 percent of the time. In order to compare this rate of absenteeism with that of other areas, we examined summary

attendance reports for two populous States (California and Illinois) and two States with less population and participation in manpower training (Kentucky and New Jersey). The reports, which covered 7,900 trainees, showed that absentee rates for these geographically dispersed States were as high as the absentee rate in Pennsylvania.

The school attendance records reviewed in Pennsylvania generally did not show the reasons for absences. For a few schools, reasons were given but sometimes they were vague with explanations such as "other urgent reason." Of the recorded reasons, sickness was the most prevalent. To the extent that sickness was the reported major cause for the trainee absenteeism of 8.5 percent, the rate appears to be out of line with the rate of absence due to sickness reported for employed persons. The Monthly Labor Review for October 1964 showed that, for the total working population in the United States, reported absences from work on account of sickness averaged 1.9 percent of scheduled working time.

Attendance standards
for termination purposes

The act does not state the conditions under which an individual's training will be terminated, and neither the Department of Labor nor the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have established minimum attendance requirements to be used as a standard for continuance of training. The responsibility for establishing these requirements has been delegated to the individual training organizations.

At 12 training facilities visited in the State of Pennsylvania, we noted that minimum attendance requirements either had not been established or, if established, had not been adequately enforced. School officials stated that they judged each trainee's case individually, taking into consideration the trainee's progress, attitude, and desire to continue in the project. Generally, school officials were reluctant to establish firm attendance requirements as a basis for terminating MDTA training because establishment of attendance requirements was not mandatory.

The large incidence of absenteeism is illustrated by the following table which lists the attendance records of selected trainees in the State of Pennsylvania, who completed MDTA courses but had a considerable number of absences and of selected trainees with substantial absences whose training was terminated.

Trainees who completed courses	Days reported present	Days reported absent	Percentage of absence
A	136	113	45
B	106	78	42
C	116	76	40
D	167	83	33
E	59	27	31
F	90	35	28
G	146	54	27
H	118	42	26
I	118	42	26
J	126	44	26
Trainees whose training was terminated			
K	80	80	50
L	44	34	44
M	30	22	42
N	93	67	42
O	106	62	37
P	108	52	33
Q	68	32	32
R	134	61	31
S	152	59	28
T	168	62	27

The information in the foregoing table shows not only instances of poor class attendance of trainees but also the lack of uniformity in making terminations. Trainees A through J were allowed to complete the courses, presumably on a satisfactory basis, while trainees K through T with a comparable rate of absenteeism were terminated.

During our review, we discussed the matter with the Director of Vocational Education for the State of Pennsylvania who expressed the belief that Federal regulations are needed to establish a workable procedure for termination of trainees having poor attendance.

He informed us that his attempts to enforce firm criteria within the State have been unsuccessful.

By letter dated June 29, 1964, we advised the Administrator, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, of certain preliminary results of our review and proposed that it might "*** be advantageous to generally limit training allowances to payments for days in attendance, unless absence is specifically excused for reasons stated in guides which would be issued by the Federal Government." Subsequently, the Manpower Administrator, Department of Labor, issued an order, dated September 2, 1964, providing for reduction of training allowances to eliminate payments for unexcused absences. This order defined excused absences as "*** normally those occasioned by illness of the trainee or illness in his family, family or financial obligations, transportation difficulties, unavoidable conditions associated with the trainees' part-time employment, etc."

The Manpower Administrator's order included the following statement of purpose.

> "The purpose of the training provisions of the MDTA is to provide training to unemployed persons who need such training to become employable in a suitable occupation. It follows that each individual selected and referred to training should, therefore, be motivated to attend training classes regularly to achieve those skills required for gainful employment in the occupation for which he is being trained.
>
> "Experience in the administration of the MDTA has indicated that motivation for regular attendance would be enhanced by providing for deductions from the training allowance for days of unexcused absence. Entitlement to a period of training under MDTA presupposes that the trainee will attend classes regularly in accordance with the requirements of the facility in which he is enrolled.

> While there is no specific provision in the MDTA concerning the effect of absences from class on the payment of training allowances, the Act authorizes the Secretary, subject to the ceilings imposed by the Act, to determine the amount of the allowance payments to eligible individuals. Under that authority, the standards for the payment of training allowances may be set by the Secretary to prohibit the payment of allowances for any period of unexcused absence."

The order noted that this action should be distinguished from the action authorized under section 202(h) of the MDTA which provides that the Secretary terminate training allowances upon certification by a training agency that a trainee does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress, "absent good cause." The order stated further:

> "Facilities for providing MDTA institutional training, whether public or private, should have clearly defined requirements relative to attendance and these requirements should be understood and uniformly applied to assure similar treatment for all trainees and the prudent use of public funds."

On October 22, 1964, the Assistant Commissioner for Vocational and Technical Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to the Department's responsibility for establishing a training policy, issued instructions substantially similar to those issued by the Department of Labor concerning reduction of training allowances to eliminate payments for unexcused absences.

Agencies' comments

By letter dated April 19, 1965, the Assistant Secretary for Administration, HEW, informed us that:

> "*** It has been generally recognized by educators in Pennsylvania, and in other States, that a 40-hour training requirement on top of the 20 hours of compensated work time, which the Act permits, tends to cause a degree of absenteeism when one considers the unusual and extenuating characteristics of the trainees, such as home and family responsibilities and study requirements."

We doubt that weekly training periods of 40 hours had an appreciable effect on increasing the absentee rate. Only five of the training projects in Pennsylvania that had been completed at the time of our review had been scheduled for 40 hours a week. In the attendance reports for the other States, we noted that only 13 of the 285 projects included in the test had been scheduled for 40 hours a week. The instructional period for all projects included in our tests averaged 31 hours a week.

Prior to April 13, 1964, the effective date of the rule permitting 20 hours of compensated work without reduction in allowances, trainees' weekly allowances were reduced 2-1/2 percent for each hour of outside work. The States were required to report to the Department of Labor the number of such reduced allowances paid to trainees. Our review of this reporting by the States indicated that, during the period January 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964, only about 3 percent of the total number of training allowance payments were reduced. Thus it appears that comparatively few of the trainees reported that they had worked even as much as one hour a week.

The Assistant Secretary stated also that:

> "In view of the unique educational, social, and economic disadvantages of MDT trainees, including family

responsibilities, the *** absentee rate for MDT trainees does not appear to be unduly excessive ***."

He stated this absentee rate was not excessive, particularly when compared to the absentee rate for pupils in school from the kindergarten through the 12th grade. We question whether a comparison between the absentee rate for voluntary trainees, the overwhelming majority of whom (86.7 percent) are at least 19 years old and certain of whom receive allowances for enrollment in the MDTA courses, and the absentee rate for children attending school is meaningful. It seems that generally decisions concerning school attendance of a pupil in the kindergarten through 12th grades are, except for truancy, made by his parents or guardians and not by the pupil, whereas decisions on attendance for most MDTA trainees are made by the trainees themselves.

The Assistant Secretary stated further that:

"In view of the diversity of training programs, training situations, and local school district attendance requirements, we do not feel it would be feasible, practicable, or equitable to develop nation-wide attendance criteria as recommended in the report. Further, a review of the legislative history of this Act indicates that Congress desired the training agency to determine whether or not a trainee's attendance record was satisfactory."

House Report 1416 dated March 12, 1962, indicates that, when a trainee does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress, the determination of the absence or presence of "good cause"--which is required before training allowances may be paid--is to be the responsibility of the training agency. However, the establishment of minimum attendance criteria for the continuance of MDTA trainees in authorized training programs is not commented upon. At the time of our review in

Pennsylvania, we observed that few schools had written criteria for determining whether attendance in MDTA projects was satisfactory.

The acting Superintendent of Public Instruction in Pennsylvania, by letter to the Office of Education dated February 9, 1965, regarding our findings, stated that, because of varied characteristics of trainees in Pennsylvania, he would hesitate to propose strict Federal regulations on attendance. Rather he would continue stressing with local administrators the responsibility for promoting maximum attendance and he believed that, if the regulations established by the Department of Labor were effectively enforced, there would be substantial improvement. At the time of our review in Pennsylvania, we observed that few schools had written criteria for determining whether attendance in MDTA projects was satisfactory. The extent to which the Labor Department's order will improve local control over attendance remains to be determined.

By letter of February 23, 1965, the Secretary of Labor stated that the order of September 2, 1964, had been designed to deal with the problem relating to payment of training allowances for periods of absence and that the Department believed that the order would correct "*** many of the cases of poor judgment by the training officials." He stated, however, that the new order had not been in effect long enough to make a determination of its full effect and that, if it was not adequate, the Department would be glad to reexamine its criteria with the view toward obtaining greater precision, achieving more uniformity, and minimizing excessive excuse of absences.

The Secretary referred to the statement in the conference report of March 12, 1962 (House Report 1416), that the determination

of good cause for absence should be the responsibility of the local training agency and noted that the Department of Labor had attempted to make local training agencies responsible also for determining whether training allowances should be paid for periods of absence. Our findings in Pennsylvania indicated, however, that training institutions were reluctant to make decisions for terminating training.

The Secretary commented further that to deny a trainee a few dollars a week often meant the difference between a trainee's continuing a course or dropping out of it. He stated that, so long as "*** reasons for absences are bona fide and not of such duration as to impede satisfactory progress in training, the training of such individual should be continued and the financial support maintained at a steady level."

We agree that training allowances should be paid regularly and at a steady level unless there are unexcused absences. We believe that, for efficient and economical administration of the program, it would be desirable to place limitations on the number of absences for which training allowances can be paid, similar to limitations established in training programs financed by the Veterans Administration.

Conclusion

The primary goal of the Manpower Development and Training Act is to promote and encourage the development of broad and diversified training programs designed to qualify for employment persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without such training and to equip the Nation's workers with the new and improved skills that are or will be required. The appropriations for MDTA training are intended to help achieve the objectives of the program.

The findings discussed in this report show that there is a high degree of absenteeism which, if permitted to continue, may jeopardize achieving the objectives of the program in an economical manner. We believe that the order of the Department of Labor of September 2, 1964, providing for the reduction of training allowances to eliminate payments for unexcused absences should help to promote better attendance and economy. Whether the order will adequately control absences, both excused and unexcused, and thus achieve a record of satisfactory attendance for continued enrollment and training can be determined only by considering future results.

Recommendations

On the basis of our review, we recommend that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare make periodic reviews and analyses of attendance and that, in the event of continuation of absences such as we noted in Pennsylvania, he provide, with the concurrence of the Department of Labor, guidelines for the use of State agencies in determining the number of absences, excused and unexcused, permissible for satisfactory attendance.

We recommend also that the Secretary of Labor, in the interests of orderly and uniform administration of the payment of training allowances, establish guideline criteria as to the number of excused absences for which training allowances may be paid.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our examination was directed toward the control exercised over attendance of trainees and the consideration given to attendance in determining allowances payable to trainees. We examined into the policies and regulations pertaining to training allowance payments issued by the Department of Labor and related policies and regulations issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We reviewed also the procedures and practices applicable to trainees' attendance and made detailed examinations of selected trainees' attendance records maintained by the State of Pennsylvania and by the Pennsylvania schools selected for review. Trainee attendance data for the States of California, Illinois, Kentucky, and New Jersey were reviewed at the Department of Labor. Our review was performed at the State Vocational Education Office, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as well as at 12 schools in Pennsylvania; the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.; and the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE HAVING RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMS

	Tenure of office From	To
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR		
SECRETARY OF LABOR:		
Arthur J. Goldberg	Jan. 1961	Sept. 1962
W. Willard Wirtz	Sept. 1962	Present
UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR:		
W. Willard Wirtz	Jan. 1961	Sept. 1962
John F. Henning	Sept. 1962	Present
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR (note a):		
John F. Henning	Feb. 1963	April 1964
John C. Donovan	April 1964	Jan. 1965
Stanley H. Ruttenberg	Jan. 1965	Present
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANPOWER, AUTOMATION AND TRAINING:		
Seymour L. Wolfbein	June 1962	Feb. 1965
John P. Walsh (acting)	Feb. 1965	June 1965
Curtis C. Aller	June 1965	Present
ADMINISTRATOR, BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY:		
Robert C. Goodwin	Aug. 1949	Present

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
AND
THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
HAVING RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ADMINISTRATION
OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMS (continued)

	Tenure of office	
	From	To
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE		
SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE:		
Abraham A. Ribicoff	Jan. 1961	July 1962
Anthony J. Celebrezze	July 1962	Aug. 1965
John W. Gardner	Aug. 1965	Present
UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE:		
Ivan A. Nestingen	Feb. 1961	May 1965
Wilbur J. Cohen	June 1965	Present
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (for Education) (note b):		
Francis Keppel	Oct. 1965	Present
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION:		
Sterling M. McMurrin	March 1961	Sept. 1962
Vacant	Sept. 1962	Dec. 1962
Francis Keppel	Dec. 1962	Jan. 1966
Harold Howe II	Jan. 1966	Present
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS, OFFICE OF EDUCATION (note c):		
Arthur L. Harris	April 1962	June 1965

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF

THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

AND

THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

HAVING RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ADMINISTRATION

OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMS (continued)

	Tenure of office	
	From	To
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (continued)		
DEPUTY ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF ADULT AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, OFFICE OF EDUCATION (note c):		
John R. Ludington	July 1965	Present

[a]Secretary's Order No. 3-63, dated February 19, 1963, established the Manpower Administration and transferred functions of the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Manpower to the Manpower Administrator. The position of Assistant Secretary for Employment and Manpower was vacated in May 1962 and was abolished.

[b]This position was created under the authority of Public Law 89-115, approved August 9, 1965.

[c]Effective July 1, 1965, the functions pertaining to manpower development and training were transferred to the newly created Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education from the Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs which was abolished.